

IN THE SPECIFICATION:

Please replace the first full paragraph of page 12 with the following:

Moving an object: There is not much of a problem with selecting an object name and dragging it to another location in the object tree. The sense of moving an object is different from that of the file system. It is only the one name for the object that is being moved. Therefore, care must be taken with parallels to cut and past paste, which would traditionally achieve move in a file system. This is a strange function because the cut file is in limbo (indicated by a grayed image) until it is pasted, until it disappears from the original location or until another file is copied or cut. To try to imitate cut, copy and paste behavior with objects may create problems.

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested. Claims 1-23 are pending.

The specification has been amended above to correct typographical errors.

Claims 16 and 20 stand rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Choy. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Examiner contends that Choy discloses a method that employs transacted services. However, at column 11, lines 13-16, Choy states, "The invention allows the development of re-usable storage management software for digital libraries, and other heterogeneous information systems, without imposing a fixed data model and transaction paradigm. Thus, Choy does not teach (and teaches away from) the employment of transacted services. The Examiner further contends that Choy teaches the step of presenting on the display a representation of a plurality of data structures. The Examiner cites column 9, lines 1-5 of Choy which states, "The LOG and IMBED

operations can appear anywhere in the sequence. The syntax for the corresponding API calls and their associated data structures is a direct mapping of the Task file 136 syntax to the target programming language and environment (e.g., C, C++)." This has nothing to do with presenting a plurality of data structures on a display as claimed. Still further, with regard to claim 20, Choy does not teach a method for enabling naming and manipulating functions for data structures in a computer subsystem of an electronics assembly system engineering system. Choy merely relates to software for a digital library. Thus, the rejection of claims 16 and 20 and the claims that depend there-from is improper and should be withdrawn.

Claims 1-2, 5, 9-13, 17-19 and 21-23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bolnick et al. in view of Choy. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Examiner states that "the 'electronics assembly engineering subsystem' is regarded as an intended use and as such, the Patent Office does not give it patentable weight." Applicant notes that "If the claim preamble, when read in the context of the entire claim, recites limitations of the claim, or if the claim preamble is 'necessary to give life, meaning and vitality' to the claim, then the claim preamble should be construed as if in the balance of the claim." Pitney Bowes, Inc. v. Hewlett-Packard Co., 182 F3d 1298, 1305, 51 USPQ2d 1161, 1165-66 (Fed. Cir. 1999). It is submitted that the preambles of claims 1, 5, 10, 11, recite limitations of the claim and thus, "electronics assembly engineering subsystem" should be given patentable weight. In that regard, Bolnick et al. do not teach or suggest the computer subsystem in an electronics assembly engineering system as claimed.

Furthermore, each independent claim requires that the "save-as" function for data structures be excluded. Bolnick et al. clearly states at column 17, lines 20 and 21 "The File menu of the Layout Editor also provides a Save entry and a Save As entry enabling a user to save a layout". See also Fig. 13 of Bolnick et al. Thus, Bolnick et al. do not teach or suggest excluding the "save-as" function for data structures as required by the claims. For these reasons, the Section 103 rejection of claims 1, 5, 10-12 and the claims that depend there-from is improper and should be withdrawn.

All objections and rejections having been addressed, it is respectfully submitted that the subject application is in condition for allowance and a Notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



Frank J. Nuzzi
Registration No. 42,944
Attorney for Applicant

SIEMENS CORPORATION
Intellectual Property Department
170 Wood Avenue South
Iselin, NJ 08830
Tel. No. (732) 321-3002